



October 9, 2008

Carol Lumb, Senior Planner  
Tukwila Department of Community Development  
6300 Southcenter Blvd.  
Suite 100, Tukwila, WA 98188

Sent by email to: [clumb@ci.tukwila.wa.us](mailto:clumb@ci.tukwila.wa.us)

RE: July 2008 Draft Shoreline Master Program

Dear Ms. Lumb:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed update to the Tukwila Shoreline Master Program. People For Puget Sound is a citizen-based, non-profit organization whose mission is to protect and restore Puget Sound. We have partnered with the city on a number of Duwamish River restoration projects, and we are participating on the Implementation Technical Committee for the WRIA 9 Salmon Recovery Plan.

We appreciate the City's efforts to update its SMP within the timeframe set by the legislature. SMP updates are an essential tool towards meeting the state's goal of restoring Puget Sound by 2020, and in the recovery of Puget Sound Chinook salmon, listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act in 1999. Protection of existing habitats and restoration of ecological functions are key to implementing the WRIA 9 Plan, which was approved by Federal agencies as part of the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan.

We support the following sections of the draft SMP, listed in order of appearance in the draft:

Chapter 5 - Restoration Element

Tukwila's riverine shorelines include the Duwamish Estuary Transition zone, where juveniles salmon osmoregulate to survive in salt water. Protection and restoration of the transition zone is a key strategy identified in the WRIA 9 Salmon Recovery Plan to recover Puget Sound Chinook salmon. We support the proposed restoration and monitoring strategies of the SMP update, including levee and revetment setback projects, excavation of historic floodplain materials to create backchannels, and enhancement of existing habitats. We urge the city to also implement stormwater BMPS for fine sediment removal as a component of its restoration and protection priorities.

EXHIBIT 38 DATE 10/9/08  
PROJECT NAME SMP Update  
FILE NO LOG-088

#### Chapter 6 – Shoreline Goals and Policies

We support the goals under Section 6.9, which ensure that shoreline development results in no net loss of shoreline ecological functions, minimizes impacts and on wildlife, and maintains significant vegetation, sandbars, wetlands, watercourses, and other critical areas. We support proposed 6.9.2 and 3, which ensures that shoreline development and activities protect riverbank vegetation, and where feasible, restore degraded riverbanks, and requires mitigation of unavoidable vegetation disturbance.

#### Chapter 7. Shoreline Environmental Designations

We support the adoption of environmental designations and supporting regulations that will provide development setbacks to accommodate sufficient room for restoration to more natural shoreline bank conditions (such as levee and revetment setbacks) while allowing for a post-restoration vegetation buffer that provides effective water quality and some habitat functions.

#### Chapter 8. Shoreline Use Regulations

We support the general use regulations that do not allow overwater structures to cause a net loss of ecological functions. We support the limits on uses and structures within shoreline buffers described in Section 8.2.

#### Chapter 9. Shoreline Development Standards

We support the new development site location requirement in section 9.2, particularly the provisions to limit new shoreline stabilization and changes to natural bank inclination, and requirements that recreational structures permitted in the buffer provide buffer mitigation.

We support the new development site location requirements in section 9.3 with respect to requirements for shoreline stabilization, vegetation, and overwater structures, all of the surface water and water quality standards of 9.4, and the flood hazard reduction requirements in section 9.5.

We support Section 9.6 addressing shoreline stabilization. In particular, we support the provisions that shoreline protection shall not be considered an outright permitted use, shall be permitted only when it has been demonstrated through a Riverbank Analysis and Report that shoreline protection is necessary for the protection of existing legally established structures and public improvements, and where allowed, shoreline armoring shall be designed, constructed and maintained in a manner that does not result in a loss of ecological functions.

We support Section 9.12, which addresses overwater structures. In particular, we support the policies requiring design and location to minimize shading of native aquatic vegetation and fish passage areas, limit removal of shoreline and aquatic vegetation, and require that natural hydraulic and geologic processes will not necessitate the need for shoreline stabilization. We also support the limits on use of pilings and other structures treated with preservatives, and ensuring that boat launch ramps be designed to minimize

fill or need for shoreline protection structures. Please consider adding a policy prohibiting discharge of solid waste or sewage into a water body and requiring that new marinas, boat yards, and dry docks provide pump out, holding, and/or treatment facilities for sewage contained on boats or vessels, and adequate restroom facilities. Also, please consider adding a policy that limits new marinas, launch ramps, and accessory uses to locations where water depths are adequate to avoid the need for dredging and minimize potential loss of ecological functions and processes.

#### Section 10 – Environmentally Sensitive Areas within Shoreline Jurisdiction

We support the buffer widths in section 10.9 (C) Wetland Watercourse, and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area Buffers. Vegetated buffers protect streams, wetlands, and rivers from impacts of urban development, such as pollution, sedimentation, and erosion, and provide vegetative cover that provides food, shelter, shade, and sources of large woody debris.

#### Section 13 - Restoration

Section 13.2 proposes to secure the ability to assure upland properties owners the range of uses allowed under the underlying zoning without having to comply with the SMP when they complete shoreline restoration projects that may relocate the ordinary high water mark.

We appreciate your efforts to encourage habitat restoration in the City by removing disincentives. It is our understanding that the City and DOE do not currently have the authority to exempt uses from the SMA in cases where the OHW has been moved for restoration purposes. People For Puget Sound is committed to working with you, DOE, and other stakeholders to develop policies, standards and criteria to remove such barriers to restoration. We look forward to working with you and the HB 2734 core group to finalize these policies and standards and in supporting subsequent legislation and plan amendments.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft SMP. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (206) 382-7007.

Sincerely,

Cyrilla Cook, AICP  
Shorelines Program Manager